Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/563,311	MURAKAMI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SHYUE JIUNN HWA	2163
All Participants:	Status of Application:	<u> </u>
(1) <u>Shyue Jiunn Hwa</u> .	(3)	
(2) Attorney Joseph Lutz.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 16 April 2009	Time:	
Type of Interview:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
1, 8, 9, 10, 17 and 18		
Prior art documents discussed: 7024400 B2, 6067259 A and 20040205457 A1		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative accepted Examiner's recommend add the limitation "a large classification label generation module for, if a virtual representative document is contained in a given cluster of the respective clusters obtained by the clustering processing, generating a label of the given cluster on which the virtual representative document is based from a term strongly connected to the virtual representative document subsequent to classification of the documents into the respective clusters, wherein said large classification generation module terminates repetition of the clustering processing when no cluster is obtained from the transformed DT matrix in the clustering processing" in claims 1 and 10. Claims 8, 9, 17 and 18 cancelled. Claims 8, 9, 17 and 18 are also commensurate in scope with amended Claims 1 and 10. Some amended in claims 1 and 10 for satisfied the 101 issue. The term "memory or processor" includes only hardware device.